

### **REMARKS**

This Amendment is fully responsive to the non-final Office Action dated September 28, 2007, issued in connection with the above identified application. A petition for a one-month extension of time is included with this Amendment. Claims 1-5 are the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-5 have been amended, and no new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

To facilitate the Examiners reconsideration of the application, the Applicants have provided amendments to the specification and abstract. The changes to the specification and abstract include editorial and clarifying changes. Additionally a replacement abstract is included. No new matter has been added by the changes to the specification and the abstract.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Specifically, the Examiner alleged that the specification, while enabling for a method of driving cells during a testing period, does not reasonably provide enablement for the claimed “method of lighting inspection.” Accordingly, the Applicants have amended the claims. Specifically, as amended, the claims now recite “a method of testing and inspecting a plasma display panel.” As noted by the Examiner, the specification supports a method and pattern for driving individual cells. The Applicants respectfully point out that it is this method and pattern of driving cells which makes the testing and inspection of the plasma display panel possible. Accordingly, claims 1-5 are fully supported by the specification. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner alleged that the Applicants have claimed a method of performing “light inspection” with no prior mention of the process or type of lighting inspection. The Applicants have amended claims 1-5 to address this rejection by the Examiner. As noted above, the Applicants have amended the claims to recite “a method of testing and inspecting a plasma display panel.” The claimed “method of testing and inspecting a plasma display panel” is based on the method and pattern of driving individual cells, which (as noted by

the Examiner) is clearly defined in the specification. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Kasahara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,414, 657, hereafter “Kasahara”).

The Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to further distinguish the present invention over the cited prior art. Claim 1 recites, in relevant part, the following:

“a method of testing and inspecting a plasma display panel... wherein, the address pulse voltage is not applied to a target cell in a predetermined sub-field to be tested and inspected, but is applied to at least one specific cell of adjacent cells positioned adjacent to the target cell, and the address pulse voltage is applied to the target cell in a successive sub-field, and it is judged whether the target cell in the successive sub-field is on or not.”

The features noted above in claim 1 are fully supported by the Applicants’ disclosure (e.g., Figures 4, 6-8).

The Applicants maintain that the cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest at least the use of an address pulse voltage not applied to a target cell in a predetermined sub-field to be tested and inspected but applied to at least one specific cell of adjacent cells, and an address pulse voltage applied to the target cell in a successive sub-field so that it can be judged whether the target cell in the successive sub-field is on or not, as recited in claim 1.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on Kasahara for disclosing all the features recited in claim 1. Kasahara discloses a display apparatus that makes use of a detector that detects a probability of pseudo-contour noise appearance as a noise quantity (MDP value). Specifically, the detector comprises a MPD calculator to calculate the MDP value, an exclusion area detector to detect an area in which diffusion processing is not performed, and a subtractor to remove an exclusion area from an area for which the MPD value has been determined (see e.g., Abstract).

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies specifically on Fig. 23B of Kasahara for disclosing or suggesting a method of applying address voltage to cells of a display, as in claim 1. As described in Kasahara, Fig. 23B illustrates a method of determining pseudo-contour noise

appearance by comparing adjacent pixels. Specifically, pixels are compared to detect pixels having different values of luminance (e.g., one pixel with a luminance of 7 and another pixel with a luminance of 8). In Kasahara, it is assumed that pseudo-contour noise appearance occurs when adjacent pixels have different values.

Accordingly, the present invention, as recited in claim 1, differs from the detector in Kasahara for at least the reasons noted below.

First, the present invention (as recited in claim 1) is directed to determining if a plasma display panel (PDP) includes cells having a problem achieving display. This is determined by testing and inspecting whether a target cell has a sustain discharge or not in a sub-field in which a sustain charge must be performed. On the other hand, the detector in Kasashar merely detects the possibility of pseudo-contour-noise appearance (i.e., an MPD value). In fact, nothing in Kasahara discloses the ability to detect whether a PDP includes cells having a problem achieving display.

Second, nowhere in Kasahara does it disclose the use of an address pulse voltage not applied to a target cell in a predetermined sub-field to be tested and inspected but applied to at least one specific cell of adjacent cells, and an address pulse voltage applied to the target cell in a successive sub-field so that it can be judged whether the target cell in the successive sub-field is on or not.

Therefore, claim 1 (as amended) is not anticipated or rendered obvious by Kasahara. Likewise, dependent claim 2-5 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Kasahara based at least on their dependency from independent claim 1.

Based on the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that all the pending claims are patentable of the prior art of record. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection presented in the Office Action dated September 28, 2007, and pass the application issue.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Tsuneo IKURA et al.

By: 

Mark D. Pratt

Registration No. 45,794

Attorney for Applicants

MDP(MSH)/ats  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
January 28, 2008